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EDITOR’S PERSPECTIVE

Greetings from the University of Missouri School of Law and welcome to a new year of the Missouri Environmental Law & Policy Review. I hope you will find this issue’s articles and notes interesting and helpful.

The first article, by Attorney Damien Schiff, focuses on whether Chief Justice Robert’s vaunted minimalism and adherence to precedent has been successful within the environmental context. To do so, he traces the Supreme Court’s holdings in the six major environmental cases that have been handed down since the Chief Justice ascended to his current position.

The second article examines the recent trend of governments that privatize their water resources. The authors, Professor Andrew Whitford and Aldo Davilla, seek to provide a set of principles (based on previous privatization efforts) for these actions to be governed by in order to achieve the most equitable system.

Third, Jeff LeBlanc analyzes recent trends in the United States’ sugar market. He specifically focuses on the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 and the developments and changes that may be considered in the near future. He closes by arguing that abolition of the government’s non-recourse loan program and an elimination of the tariff system are in the best interests of the United States as well as international sugar farmers.

The fourth article, by Christopher Koschnitzky, scrutinizes the proposed legislation amending the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (“EPAct”) in light of the numerous hurricanes that have impacted our nation’s oil refineries.

The case notes in this issue address some of the most potent issues that have been litigated in recent years. The first note, by Jennifer Wieman, examines the 8th Circuit’s decision regarding the impact of methamphetamine on the environment in U.S. v. Pinnow. Her article
examines the case law that the 8th Circuit relied on in reaching its decision and considers the standards used to identify environmental harm.

Amy Gleghorn’s note looks at the litigation involved in Fund for Animals, Inc. v. U.S. Bureau of Land Management. Her note argues that the Court of Appeals’ decision provides litigants little means to challenge decisions by the Bureau of Land Management.

Robert Cornejo wades into the definition of “contamination” in his note profiling the 2nd Circuit’s decision in Parks Real Estate Purchasing Group v. St. Paul Fire and Marine Ins. Co. His note contends that the Court of Appeals used the correct approach on an issue which has split many in the legal community.

Fourth, Darryl Chatman’s note on Barasich v. Columbia Gulf Transmission Co., argues that the Court got it wrong when it dismissed a lawsuit brought by residents of Louisiana against several oil and gas companies. His note points out how the decision weakened property rights and environmental protection in a post-Katrina Louisiana.

Finally, you will find several updates on the very latest cases decided in the area of environmental law from around the country.

I hope the articles and notes profiled in this issue will be beneficial to those in the legal and academic communities.

Elijah J. L. Haahr
Editor-In-Chief